

When reading literary works from the Later Roman Empire, the difficulties of dating events within them become apparent quickly. Even when an educated person writes about a historical figure, details remain unclear. The Life of St. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre, by Constantius of Lyon is a perfect example.<sup>1</sup> More likely than not, the author finishes his work in the last quarter of the fifth century A.D. while the most firmly dated moment in it occurs about fifty years prior to its completion. This incident does not signify the start or the end of Germanus's episcopate, instead it marks a point within it. This has caused great debate over the correct timespan for Germanus's episcopate. The purpose of this paper is to summarize *Vita Germani*, provide a contemporarily based chronology, and offer further insight on the matter.

Professor Ian Wood provides a dating maxim by stating the following<sup>2</sup>:

“Any calculation of the chronology of Germanus's episcopate depends upon the *Gesta Pontificum* of Auxerre, which states that the saint held office for thirty years and twenty-five days, take together with the evidence of *Vita Amatoris*, which records the death of Germanus's predecessor as taking place on Wednesday May 1<sup>st</sup>. This limits the possible accession-dates to 407, 412, and 418.”

Wood dates Germanus's episcopate to the years 407 to 437. He does this by gleaning details from the Life of Severus. Holding no illusion about the source material, though, Wood declares that the *Gesta Pontificum*, *Vita Amatoris*, and *Vita Seueri* are not fifth-century texts. He suggests that corroborative evidence may be gained from the careers of Goar, Sigisult, and Tibatto.<sup>3</sup> A similar chronology shall be pursued here, but without input from the *Vita Seueri* or *Vita Hilarii*,<sup>4</sup> which has been used to establish an alternative time period for Germanus's episcopate. The reason for not using either is an attempt to limit the inherent issues that result from dealing with a hagiography – *What details are historically reliable? When was the extant text written? Why did the author write the vita in the first place, and what did he seek to achieve?*

As such, a sole reliance has been placed on contemporary and near-contemporary sources. Their issues shall be noted as attention draws us to them.

Traditionally, about twenty-five years separate the death of Germanus (448)<sup>5</sup> and the completion of his hagiography (470/480).<sup>6</sup> Contemporaries hold the author, Constantius of Lyon, in high regards. Still, Constantius asks for forgiveness due to his own inadequacies, and for providing a complete account of *Vita Germani*. He presents these pleas at the beginning, the middle, and the end of his work.<sup>7</sup> Before his first apology, Constantius starts with two dedications. The first, he addresses to Bishop Patiens of Lyon,<sup>8</sup> followed by one to Bishop Censurius of Auxerre.<sup>9</sup> In both dedications, Constantius describes the two bishops as apostolic and Fathers in God.

The preface ends with the following statement<sup>10</sup>:

“Indeed, I should have preferred that another than myself should have been the historian of such good things, for whoever he was he would have been more worthy than I. But since this has not come about, better myself than no one.”

In addition to the two dedications and the preface, his hagiography consists of forty-six chapters of varying lengths. The first chapter<sup>11</sup> provides the details of Germanus’s life before being conscripted into a bishop. It states he is a native of Auxerre and his parents are high-ranking citizens. Germanus obtains an education in the Gallic lecture-rooms and studies law in Rome. As E. A. Thompson describes him, Germanus “had practiced as an advocate in the court of the Urban or Praetorian Prefect.”<sup>12</sup> During this time, he marries a highborn lady. Eventually, Germanus receives the rank of *dux* and governs over more than one province. The official recording of his appointment and the range of his authority have faded from the annals of time. We are left to speculate on this major issue.

In §2, *Vita Germani* states<sup>13</sup>:

“A war was declared by the people against their magistrate (Germanus), who was easily overcome, since even his own staff turned against him. Thus he received the fulness of the priesthood under compulsion, as a conscript; but, this done, immediately he made the change complete. He deserted the earthly militia to be enrolled in the heavenly; the pomps of this world were trodden underfoot; a lowly way of life was adopted, his wife was turned into a sister, his riches were distributed among the poor and poverty became his ambition.”

This seems reminiscent of the following excerpt from Zosimus<sup>14</sup>:

“The whole of Armorica and other Gallic provinces, in imitation of the Britons, freed themselves in the same way by expelling the Roman magistrates and establishing the government they wanted.”

If the two writers describe the same revolt, then Germanus stops being a state-appointed *dux* sometime after 409. Wood voices caution in regards to Zosimus’s account of British affairs due to his distance from the events as a sixth-century Byzantine writer and being a questionable copier of his source material.<sup>15</sup> Still, Zosimus is not the only source revealing this breakdown of Roman order in the West at that particular time. Here are the key excerpts taken from Prosper of Aquitaine, the Gallic Chronicle of 452, and Olympiodorus of Thebes for the years 395 to 410. They centralize on the activities of Stilicho, but mention other relevant points.

The account of the Roman commander by Prosper is brief. Besides mentioning that Stilicho was the co-consul of Aurelianus (400) and Anthemius (405), Prosper states only this for the latter year<sup>16</sup>:

“After the deaths of many thousands of Goths, Ragadaisus was overcome and captured in Tuscany by Stilicho, the commander of the army.”

This single entry by Prosper seems at odds with the amount of details that the Gallic Chronicle of 452 provides. From 395 to 408, the Gallic Chronicler provides a handful of entries for Stilicho. Here are the entries<sup>17</sup>:

~395 – Stilicho killed Rufinus of the Bosphorus region after overcoming the guard of Huns that supported him, because Rufinus reached the summit of imperial service but could not abide that Stilicho was preferred to him.

~397 – Stilicho, master of the soldiers, killed Gildo in Mauretania and restored Africa to its former status.

405 – Radagaisus laid many cities waste before he fell; his division of his army into three parts under different leaders opened up to the Romans some means of resisting. Stilicho wheeled around his Hun auxiliaries and annihilated a third part of the enemy force in a notable victory.

~408 – The fury of various peoples began to tear Gaul to pieces. Stilicho set them loose as much as he could, indignant that his son had been denied the kingdom.

~408 – Many advised, among other things, the death of Stilicho in the interests of the state, because he was devising plots against the well-being of the emperor.

Olympiodorus has a great deal to say about Stilicho, also. Among other things, he describes the Vandal as the appointed guardian of emperors Arcadius and Honorius, chosen by their father, Theodosius the Great. In reference to Stilicho's victory over Radagaisus, the Theban states the following<sup>18</sup>:

“To achieve this victory, however, almost all available troops had to be withdrawn from Britain and the Rhine frontier, thus opening the way to accumulating disasters in both places. In the next year a huge host of German tribes crossed the Rhine almost unopposed—Burgundians, Vandals, Sueves and Franks. Instead of opposing them or trying to protect the Gauls, Stilicho was again involved with the Eastern Empire over the perennial dispute about Illyricum.”

In a later fragment, Olympiodorus states<sup>19</sup>:

“...Britain had been lost to a usurper who took advantage of the great invasion of the Rhine and Stilicho’s preoccupation with Illyricum. There was no doubt discontent there with the rule of the Vandal Stilicho and with the lack of attention his government paid to the defense of Britain against the Picts.”

The Theban writer has more to state in regards to Stilicho, but what has been provided by him and the other ancient authors should convey two key points. First and foremost, both the Romans in Britain and Gaul had clear reasons to be dissatisfied with the imperial rule under Stilicho. The master of soldiers fails “to protect the Gauls” or maintain “the defense of Britain”. Secondly, there is a lack of commentary by Prosper on this important Roman general. The significance of his silence will be expounded, later. If one is still not convinced of the chaotic state of the western empire in the first decade of the fifth century, then what follows should solidify it.

Besides telling that the Saxons laid waste to the British province, the Gallic Chronicle of 452 states<sup>20</sup>:

“At this time, as the host of the enemies grew stronger, the powers of the Romans were weakened to their very foundation.”

Olympiodorus of Thebes states<sup>21</sup>:

“At the beginning of 410 there were thus six emperors, Honorius and Theodosius II, Attalus in Rome, Constantine, Constans, and Maximus.”

Prosper of Aquitaine declares<sup>22</sup>:

“Rome was captured by the Goths under the command of Alaric, and for this reason there was only a consul for the east, a practice followed the next year as well.”

With fire and brimstone reminiscent of Gildas, Bishop Hydatius states<sup>23</sup>:

“As the barbarians rampaged out of control through the Spanish provinces and disease caused no less an affliction, the wealth and resources safely stored in the cities were snatched away by the tyrannical tax-collector and used up by the soldiers. Severe hunger spread so that human beings, compelled by hunger, consumed human flesh.”

“...”

“And so with the four misfortunes of sword, hunger, disease, and beasts raging everywhere throughout the world, the predictions foretold by the Lord through his prophets were fulfilled.”

Continuing with the overview, §3 through §6 cover the daily life of Bishop Germanus and end with the founding of his monastery. F.R. Hoare notes that Germanus dedicates it to the twin physicians, Cosmas and Damian,<sup>24</sup> who “reputedly never accepted payment for their services” and were “mercilessly punished for their devotion, both to the practice of healing and especially their religious commitments.”<sup>25</sup>

Next, §7 begins with<sup>26</sup>:

“There was at that time a man of high character named Januarius who was in the Governor’s service as head of his office staff and used to bring him the gold collected in taxes from the Province. One day he broke his journey to visit the Bishop and mislaid his handbag.”

The chapter ends with the bishop assisting Januarius in reclaiming his gold coins and exorcising the demons from the would-be thief.

In §8, a plague ravages the congregation of Bishop Germanus, targeting the young and elderly.<sup>27</sup> The windpipes of the victims swell and death follows a few days later. After blessing some oil, though, the bishop rubs the holy ointment on the throats of the afflicted. Soon afterwards, the swelling disappears and the treated can breathe and swallow, once more. The Gallic Chronicle of 452 notes an enormous famine in Gaul for the year of 413.<sup>28</sup>

The following three sections (9, 10, and 11) do not seem to supply any historical events. The first tells how Germanus makes a surprise visit to his own monastery and helps a possessed monk.<sup>29</sup> The next section describes how he stops and stays the night at a haunted house. When confronted by an apparition, the bishop pacifies the ghost by giving his remains and those of his dead partner-in-crime a proper burial.<sup>30</sup> In §11, Germanus feeds a household's oddly silent roosters, afterwards, the birds return to their natural crowing.<sup>31</sup>

As most do, §12 through §18 are seen as occurring in 429 or shortly thereafter. These chapters tell of when Bishop Germanus travels to Britain with Bishop Lupus of Troyes. In the first of these sections, a synod assembles and elects the two bishops to combat the Pelagian heresy in Britain.<sup>32</sup> Then in the next chapter, the ship suffers from rough seas. The bishop calms both the waters and the people onboard.<sup>33</sup> And when their ship reaches the shores of Britain, crowds greet the bishops. In §14, the bishops debate the Pelagian supporters.<sup>34</sup> In the next section before the end of the debate, a man of tribunician power along with his wife appear and give their blind ten-years-old daughter to Germanus. The bishop cures her blindness.<sup>35</sup> After performing this miracle and silencing the heretics, the bishop visit the shrine of Alban in §16. Also in this section, Germanus injures his foot in a fall. While bedridden, divine intervention protects him from a fire as it consumes much of the settlement surrounding him. The section ends with a shining figure in snow-white clothes appearing and healing Germanus one night.<sup>36</sup>

The Saxons and the Picts join forces to wage war on the British at the start of §17 while the bishops prepare to celebrate Easter. Hearing of the barbarians approaching, Germanus takes command of the gathered men and heads out to face the enemy.<sup>37</sup> In §18, Bishop Germanus and his men shout out “Alleluia!” causing the Saxons and the Picts to retreat. Many of the barbarians

drown in the river they had crossed recently. The section ends with the victorious bishops sailing home.<sup>38</sup>

Returning to Gaul in §19,<sup>39</sup> Germanus finds his diocese distressed by heavy taxes so he travels across Gaul to address the issue. It should be noted how the next three sections begin.

At the start of §20, Constantius declares<sup>40</sup>:

“I think it worth while putting on record that even the journey (a trip to Arles for tax relief) itself was notable for miracles.” [*He pardons a thief then clothes him.*]

In §21<sup>41</sup>:

“This man (Germanus) so full of God always tried to keep his deeds secret and to be insignificant in men’s eyes, but his miracles made him famous...” [*People flock to him as he travels.*]

For §22<sup>42</sup>:

“I would think it a sin to pass by in silence the miracle he worked while stopping at Alise (to visit Senator the priest and his wife, Nectariola).” [*The demons of Agrestius are cast out.*]

Now, consider the 433 entry in the Gallic Chronicle of 452<sup>43</sup>:

“Germanus the bishop of Auxerre became renowned for his miraculous powers and the strictness of his life.”

Giving further context to the situation, for the prior year, the same source states<sup>44</sup>:

“There was severe cold that was also ruinous to the health of a great many people.”

Synchronizing the three chapters with the Gallic Chronicle of 452 seems logical when §24 of *Vita Germani* is taken in account, also. Here, Bishop Germanus meets Auxiliaris, the Praetorian Prefect of Gaul, in Arles. Based on the known terms of office for Auxiliaris and Eparchius Avitus, the meeting occurs in between 435 and 439.<sup>45</sup> As such, §20 through §22 occur after 429 but before 439, with a high likelihood of taking place in the first half of that decade (433).

In between Bishop Germanus—sailing the Saone to Lyon—curing its maladies and his arrival in Arles (§23), Constantius states, “May God forgive me for omitting so much that I know.”<sup>46</sup> Following this in the same chapter, Bishop Hilary of Arles receives Bishop Germanus as he enters the imperial capital of Gaul for the first time. Nothing more is said about the bishop of Arles. Then, Germanus meets Auxiliaris in §24, as previously stated. Before returning to his diocese at the end of that chapter, though, Germanus treats and cures the prefect’s wife, who suffers from episodes of extreme shakes and fevers.<sup>47</sup>

Bishop Germanus’s second trip to Britain, this time, with Bishop Severus of Trier begins in §25.<sup>48</sup> A leading man in Britain, Elafius, and many people from his province welcome the arrival of the bishops in §26.<sup>49</sup> Shortly thereafter, a few Pelagian followers are “identified and formally condemned”. The sickly son of Elafius mentioned in the previous chapter is finally healed by Bishop Germanus in §27.<sup>50</sup> As if a gift for returning the boy’s leg to a sound state, the Pelagian preachers are brought to the bishop so they can be banished.

Following the second trip to Britain, §28 states<sup>51</sup>:

“He (Germanus) had hardly got home after his overseas expedition when a deputation from Armorica, came with a petition to the weary prelate. For Aetius the Magnificent, who then governed the state, had been enraged by the insolence of that proud region and, to punish it for daring to rebel, had given Goar, the savage King of the Alans, permission to subdue it; and Goar, with a barbarian’s greed, was thirsting for its wealth.”

The entries for 441-42 in the Gallic Chronicle of 452 state<sup>52</sup>:

“The British provinces, which up to this time had endured a variety of disasters and misfortunes, were subjected to the authority of the Saxons.”

“The lands of Farther Gaul were handed over by the patrician Aëtius to the Alans to be divided with the inhabitants. They subdued those who opposed them with arms, drove out the owners, and obtained possession of the land by force.”

The second part of the Gallic entry seems to discuss the same event previously mentioned by Constantius. If this is true, such dating would put the current chronology past 437. John of Antioch states that Aëtius put down the Armoric rebellions in 438, 439, and 442.<sup>53</sup> Though most likely a 7<sup>th</sup>-century writer, C. D. Gordon still sees John of Antioch as a rich source for 5<sup>th</sup>-century, contemporary history. Gordon thinks John used the best authors of that period for his universal chronicle.<sup>54</sup>

King Goar’s interaction with Bishop Germanus in §28 should be considered carefully. Here are the known details regarding Goar. Most likely taking place in the first decade of the fifth century, Gregory of Tours cites Renatus Profuturus Frigeridus a century later for the following: “...Goar had gone over to the Romans, and Respendial, the King of the Alani, therefore withdrew his forces from the Rhine.”<sup>55</sup> In an extant fragment of Olympiodorus, Goar helps to lead the Great Barbarian Invasion of 406. In the next year, he partakes in the plundering of Moguntiacum (Mainz) in Germany. About five years later, Goar assists in the elevation of the usurper, Jovinus (412/413). And though exhibiting multiple transgressions against the empire, Goar serves Emperor Honorius, periodically, and remains a king of the Alans for many years.<sup>56</sup> According to Constantius, Goar continues to serve the imperial interest over three decades later. Such longevity for any leader at that time is noteworthy. Considering only the details provided by Olympiodorus reveals the complexity of the Alan king and warrants caution in handling §28.

To help evaluate this critical chapter further, **APPENDIX A** has been generated. It is a summary of events involving Gaul, Aëtius, and/or civil disorder from 427 to 451. These details come from the following authors: John of Antioch (JoA),<sup>57</sup> Prosper of Aquitaine (PoA),<sup>58</sup> Gallic

Chronicle of 452 (GC452),<sup>59</sup> Bishop Hydatius (HYD).<sup>60</sup> Fragment 196 from John of Antioch is the source material for the (JoA) entries listed under each year. If there is no applicable information for a source in a particular year, then (N/A) is entered next to that source. For example, underneath the year heading of 427, there is no applicable information (N/A) from Prosper of Aquitaine (PoA) or Bishop Hydatius (HYD) while John of Antioch (JoA) states that Aëtius battles the Goths and Franks. The Gallic Chronicle of 452 (GC452) states that Aëtius frees Arles from the Goths. It can be argued that if the Romans are militarily active in Gaul, then it is under the orders of Aëtius. Still, when Aëtius is “not specifically mentioned” by a source, then a (NSM) appears next to the pertinent details. The first entry marked with (NSM) is under the 436 header next to (PoA).

Upon reviewing the data, there are many noteworthy things. First off, Prosper never mentions the *Bacaudae*, not the ones in Gaul or in Spain. Prosper makes no mention of civil unrest in Gaul except for the undefined troubles between Aëtius and Albinus. The only other conflicts he documents are military in nature, concerning the imperial clashes with the barbarian tribes, and the power struggles between the Roman generals. Secondly, Aëtius’s wars ravage Gaul from 435 through 439, the period when Bishop Germanus meets Prefect Auxiliaris in Arles. And though the Gallic Chronicle calls the war against the Burgundians memorable, there is a discrepancy on the date. John and Prosper agree that it happened in 435, but the Gallic Chronicle and Hydatius suggest later dates, 436 and 437 respectively. One may note that the variance between the sources (435 to 437) matches the time span for the entries mentioning Tibatto. The relevance of this association is up for debate, but what does not appear questionable is the wide-ranging chaos in Gaul for those particular years. Every year from 435 to 439, one source or another notes some type of trouble plaguing Gaul. Finally, the most obvious and most important

observation, as it applies to the chronology of *Vita Germani*, is that no source documents any warfare in Gaul from 444 to 450. Only in 448 and 449 is Bacaudic unrest mentioned in Gaul and Spain, respectively. For Gaul, a single individual (Eudoxius) is implicated in the Bacaudae and flees (with the ‘to’ and ‘from’ undefined, only implied). This makes it unlikely that the confrontation of §28 or the rebellion of §40 occurred between 444 and 450. As such, an earlier date for these chapters seems logical. Comparing §28 with the Gallic entry for 441/442, once more, it may be noticed that they share, at least, two if not three points of similarity. Both tell of trouble in Armorica/Farther Gaul, and that Aëtius uses the Alans to restore order, and possibly that Aëtius is identified as a patrician. The last of these three points will be clarified later in the paper. The entries for the years 435, 437, and 448 only share one of these details—a varying degree of unrest in Armorica/Farther Gaul.

Continuing with the overview of *Vita Germani*, after confronting King Goar, Germanus begins his journey to Ravenna, Italy. During this time, various people appear, but the events lack enough details to date. In §29, the bishop stops in Alise and visits his friend, Senator the priest. While there, Germanus heals a girl about twenty-years-old so she can speak once more.<sup>61</sup> Following this, the bishop travels and reaches Autun in §30. There he helps a girl suffering from a terrible condition that constricts her fingers into her palm, causing wounds to her right hand. Gently, Germanus relieves her ailment by straightening out her fingers, one by one.<sup>62</sup> Later, during his journey in §31, the bishop assists a lame, elderly worker. First, Germanus carries the old man’s pack, and then he hauls the old man on his back across the mountain stream.<sup>63</sup>

In §32, Germanus arrives at an assembly of bishops in Milan during the festival of its saints (June 19 – SS. Gervasius and Protasius). The next excerpt appears in the middle of that chapter as Germanus’s presence becomes known and one of the congregation shouts<sup>64</sup>:

“Germanus, why do you pursue us into Italy? Be content that you have driven us out of Gaul. Be content that your prayers have defeated both us and the ocean. Why do you scour the whole world? Take a rest and let us have a rest ourselves.”

Afterwards, Germanus exorcises the possessed man during the assembly. Departing from Milan in §33,<sup>65</sup> the bishop and his retinue happen by some beggars. Though only having three gold pieces left, the bishop orders his deacon to give them all to the unfortunates. His servant only gives them two coins. As the bishop travels on, shortly thereafter, the men of Leporius ride up to him, and ask him to help their sick master. The bishop agrees. The riders pay Germanus a hundredfold for his kindness, revealing the nature of his deacon by only receiving two hundred pieces. In §34, the bishop treats Leporius and his household then leaves the next morning.<sup>66</sup>

The time that Germanus appears in Ravenna runs from §35 to §44. In the first section, the bishop arrives at night but his presence is made known. He receives a silver platter of food from Empress Placidia, and he gives her a barley loaf on a wooden plate in return.<sup>67</sup> In the next chapter, the bishop frees some prisoners.<sup>68</sup> Afterwards, Bishop Germanus heals the sick while six bishops marvel at him in §37.<sup>69</sup> During §38, Germanus resurrects the son of Volusianus, the first secretary to Sigisult the Patrician.<sup>70</sup>

Though interaction between the bishop and the German is debatable, here are the details we have on Sigisult. In 427, Count Sigisult takes command of the war against General Boniface in Africa after the treachery of General Sanoeces causes his own death and those of Generals Mavortius and Gallio.<sup>71</sup> The Arian bishop of Sigisult, Maximinus, debates Bishop Augustine of Hippo while in Africa.<sup>72</sup> For the second consulate of Aëtius in 437, Sigisult serves as co-consul.<sup>73</sup> In the summer of 440, Sigisult organizes the coastal defenses of Italy against Vandal attacks.<sup>74</sup> There appears to be no further mentioning of this imperial officer except by Constantius in §38. Only a later, questionable source identifies Sigisult as a patrician.<sup>75</sup> Though

some rightfully point this out as a possible issue with Constantius's account, once other factors are considered, this author surmises that it will help exemplify Constantius's skills as a writer. More will be said on this contentious point later.

In §39, the bishop exorcises a demon from the adopted son of Acolus, a eunuch and Imperial Chamberlain.<sup>76</sup> The next section might be the most important one when it comes to considering the chronology of *Vita Germani*. In §40, Constantius mentions the affairs of Armorica, the treachery of Tibatto, and repeated rebellions. Unfortunately, there is not much more beyond that. Due to the wording of the Gallic entries mentioning Tibatto and §40, questions remain unanswered. Still, here are the entries from the sources in their entirety.

For the year 435, the Gallic Chronicle of 452 states<sup>77</sup>:

“Farther Gaul followed Tibatto, the leader of rebellion, and separated from Roman society. This was only the beginning of almost all the servile order [*sevitia*] of Gaul coming into accord in a Bacaudic revolt (*Bacauda*).”

Here is the entry for 437 in the Gallic Chronicle of 452<sup>78</sup>:

“After Tibatto was captured and the other leaders of the revolt were put in bonds or killed, the commotion of the Bacaudae quietened down.”

And, this is §40 in *Vita Germani*<sup>79</sup>:

“It had been the affairs of Armorica that had made this long journey necessary and Germanus would undoubtedly have had them settled as he wished, by obtaining the Americans pardon and security for the future, if it had not been for the treachery of Tibatto, who persuaded that fickle and undisciplined people to rebel again. After that, not even the intercession of the Bishop could do anything for them, for common prudence made it impossible for the Imperial government to trust them; and their many times perjured leader before long paid the penalty of his reckless treason.

Other than what appears above, there are no more specific references to Tibatto. So, with only his capture being mentioned by the Gallic Chronicle and his implied execution in §40,

Tibatto's final days are left open for interpretation. Much can be inferred but restraint should be maintained.

Here is the summary of details in §40 as this author sees them:

- Bishop Germanus travels to obtain a pardon for the people of Armorica.
- Due to rebelling again (seemingly *after* the truce with King Goar), peace is unattainable.
- Later, their many times perjured leader (Tibatto) receives the penalty of a traitor (death).

If these details along with those in §28 are truly compatible with the contemporary sources, then the following scenario seems the most logical. Tibatto and others cause an uprising in Farther Gaul (435). Count Litorius and his auxiliary of Huns crush the Armoric rebels before riding south to Narbonne (436).<sup>80</sup> The Romans capture Tibatto and some of the leaders while killing others. The Bacaudae quietens down (437). Sometime between 437 and 442, though, Tibatto escapes. Aëtius campaigns in the region for the next couple of years (438/439). An uneasy peace remains for a short while (440/441). Then, hostilities ensue, once more. Aëtius sends King Goar and his Alans to restore imperial order. Bishop Germanus receives a deputation from Armorica. And, on their behalf, the bishop secures a temporary truce with King Goar. Before Bishop Germanus can achieve permanent peace, Tibatto causes another rebellion. (442).

Moving on to §41, the bishop tells his brethren that he dreamt of dying.<sup>81</sup> In the next section, a few days later, Germanus falls ill. Empress Placidia fulfills the bishop's dying request and tells him that she will return his body to Auxerre. Afterwards, the bishop dies.<sup>82</sup>

In §43, various people claim Bishop Germanus's belongings: Empress Placidia (his reliquary), Bishop Peter Chrysologus (his cloak and hairshirt), and the six unnamed prelates (his pallium, his girdle, with his tunic and soldier's cape each being divided in halves).<sup>83</sup> Acolius has the bishop's body embalmed, Empress Placidia sees to the vestments, while Emperor Valentinian provides the bier and the servants to escort the funeral procession through Gaul in §44.<sup>84</sup> When

the body of the bishop reaches Piacenza and is placed in the church for the night in §45, a paralyzed woman lays underneath the bier and rises the next morning miraculously healed.<sup>85</sup>

In §46, the final chapter of *Vita Germani*, people of all sorts contribute and pay homage to Bishop Germanus's funeral procession. Roads are repaired and bridges are restored in his honor.<sup>86</sup> Afterwards, Constantius asks for forgiveness due his poor wording and his failure to mention certain miracles. Then, Constantius ends his work with this final sentence: "I think that I have written too summarily rather than too much."<sup>87</sup>

And as such, here ends the overview of *Vita Germani*.

### **Conjectures and ramifications**

The following is further elaboration on what has been presented so far. These remarks shall be given in a sequential manner like that of the overview and the work, itself. Before continuing, though, some general observations shall be made about Constantius. The civil chaos in the sources mirrored by the events of *Vita Germani* have been revealed, but the ecclesiastical discord has received little attention. What has been shown (Bishop Germanus appearing as Rome's champion against the Pelagian heresy) is a somewhat-skewed view of the contemporary state of affairs. The variations between Prosper's and Constantius's versions of the first trip to Britain hint at this issue.<sup>88</sup> In Thompson's work, he questions why Constantius is ignorant of the actions of the pope.<sup>89</sup> Based on what Constantius has written, this complaint is warranted. Still, this general conclusion appears flawed. Constantius seems to match Sidonius's ability in the art of writing. In fact, by completing *Vita Germani*, he accomplishes what Sidonius could not.<sup>90</sup> It seems likely then that Constantius had the ability to cast his hero as he wanted his audience to view him. As such, there must be reasons for Constantius's silence on various issues, or at least some of them.

While in Italy, Germanus has dealings with multiple bishops. All but one remains nameless. And for the one identified, Constantius gives little heed to him. The see of Rome is not mentioned at all. Based on Constantius's words, Bishop Germanus shows no concern for any pope. Four different men presided over the see of Rome during the floruit of Germanus, and none of them were deemed worthy of mentioning. Constantius treats the see of Rome with indifference, possibly even shunning it. If this is truly the case, one is forced to ask, "Why?"

By writing *Vita Germani*, it could be said that Constantius establishes a historical precedence for a bishop operating outside his own diocese, independent of papal consent. As such, *Vita Germani* may be a Gallic rebuttal to Rome's push for primacy. This interpretation could explain why Constantius chooses not to record any teachings or sermons of Germanus, another issue that Thompson points out.<sup>91</sup>

In the traditional span of Germanus's episcopate, Prosper of Aquitaine mentions four Christian heresies: Pelagian (418), Nestorian (431), Arian (437), Eutychian (448).<sup>92</sup> Three of them originate from contemporaries of Germanus. Differing views between the Christians are not in short supply at this time. Maybe, Constantius feels that the words of Germanus would not hold up under Rome's critical eye. Fearing that Germanus's words eventually be condemned, Constantius has the bishop remain silent and lets the bishop's actions speak on his behalf.

This assumption does not seem too far-fetched if we look at another contemporary who Sidonius held in high regards. In a letter to Bishop Faustus of Riez, Sidonius states, "In future the word lies with you, my Lord Bishop. It is yours to devote yourself to the teaching of sound and perfect doctrine in works destined to live..."<sup>93</sup> Though Sidonius feels this way, O. M. Dalton tells how Bishop Faustus's "writings, which give evidence of a modified Pelagianism, were regarded heretical after his death, but were not condemned in his lifetime."<sup>94</sup>

Before moving on, here is a further note regarding the last correspondent. Despite addressing only two letters in his collection to Bishop Faustus, Sidonius still seems sincere when he tells the bishop that they are “closely joined in mutual affection.”<sup>95</sup> One can only speculate if Bishop Faustus and Constantius of Lyon had bonded the same way. More likely than not, their paths would have crossed in Lyon. Both pay tribute to the church built by Bishop Patiens. As an eminent poet, Constantius provides a hexameter for the altar<sup>96</sup> while Bishop Faustus delivers an oration at the church dedication.<sup>97</sup> Also being personally connected to this event, Sidonius provides an inscription telling how this church, on one side, has “a noisy high-road, on the other, the echoing Arar (Saone)” where its “company of the bargemen, their backs bent to their work, raise a boatmen’s shout to Christ, and the banks echo their alleluia.”<sup>98</sup> All of this is showcased over a weeklong festival.

Is it possible that the idea to write *Vita Germani* first came up here, also? It is not a struggle to envision a round-table discussion about Bishop Germanus taking place at that time. The author of the *vita*, its first dedicatee, and a possible source for British affairs would have been in the same location. Though distant, there may have been a chance that Bishop Lupus even attended the church dedication.

For now, let us return to the period when Germanus transitions from being a *dux* to a bishop. As previously cited for this period, Bishop Hydatius tells how war, pestilence, and starvation plague the Romans while tyrannical tax-collectors strip the cities of the wealth.<sup>99</sup> This summarizes what was happening throughout the western empire and not just in the Spanish provinces. That being said, the woes from §2 to §8 that appear in *Vita Germani* (removal from imperial office, troubles with tax collectors, and pestilence)<sup>100</sup> reflect events in the contemporary sources for the years 406 to 413. This chaos seems to be lacking in the same sources for the

standard start of Germanus's episcopate in 418. It is in the prior year (417) that Emperor Honorius has reined in the social disorder as he enters Rome in a triumph with Attalus the usurper walking ahead of his chariot.<sup>101</sup> Technically, the earliest possible year (407) has the necessary revolt to match the one in §2. The British usurper, Constantine, arriving in Gaul shows that. Still, the wording of Zosimus's passage supports the later date of 412 by stating that the first Gallic overthrow happens after 407.

One should remember that four men (Honorius, Constantine, Attalus, Maximus) claim to be the Emperor of the West in 410. Each man would have had men serving underneath him. Naturally, these officials would run the gambit of the magistrates required to run an empire. In this turmoil, the validity of each magistrate's claim to their office would fluctuate with the rise and fall of the emperor whom they served. As a *dux* for Emperor Honorius, Germanus would have had to face 'the people' of these usurpers as they tried to claim his position and authority. Jovinus the usurper came to power around 412.<sup>102</sup> If, as *Vita Germani* implies, 'the people' forced the conscription of Germanus, then it would have occurred at this time when one follows Wood's dating maxim.

Moving on, let us ponder more about Bishop Germanus's monastery on the river Yonne in §6. There might be some significance to the monastery's original dedicatees – the twin physicians, Cosmas and Damian. The miracles and healings of Bishop Germanus have received limited attention. The premier exception would be Wood's comments on the blind 10-years-old girl and how this is a possible reference to the ten years that the British Christians had strayed from the orthodox.<sup>103</sup> The possible ramifications of Wood's thought shall be discussed later. And though Thompson<sup>104</sup> is unimpressed by the wonders attributed to Germanus, the subject should be reviewed a little further. Some of the miracles seem to match those of Cosmas and Damian.

One source states that the twin physicians cure infectious diseases, restore eyesight, and return mobility to disabled patients. In addition to doing these same things, Germanus heals someone posthumously as does Cosmas and Damian.<sup>105</sup>

Still, there are, at least, fourteen examples of physical and spiritual healings that Constantius attributes to Germanus. Below are the ones this author noticed. The section number where the event appears in the text has been listed left of the examples. To help facilitate quick referencing, the instances of *spiritual healing* will show up in *italic*. The examples that may indicate **real physical healing** have been **bolded**.

1. § 7 – *He exorcises the demons from the thief of Januarius.*
2. § 8 – **With blessed oil, he cures the swollen throats of his congregation.**
3. § 9 – *He cast a demon out of a monk at his monastery.*
4. §15 – In Britain, he returns sight to a 10-year-old girl.
5. §22 – *The straw that he slept on drives out the demon in Agrestius.*
6. §24 – **In Arles, he cures the wife of Auxiliaris.**
7. §27 – **In Britain, he heals a boy's leg.**
8. §29 – He helps a 20-year-old girl to speak.
9. §30 – **He relieves a girl's hand constriction.**
10. §32 – *He exorcises a man at an assembly in Milan.*
11. §34 – **He treats the household of Leporius.**
12. §38 – He resurrects the son of Volusianus.
13. §39 – *He exorcises the son of Acolus.*
14. §45 – His corpse cures a paralyzed woman in Piacenza (Placentia).

Though all of these examples may be standard hagiographical filler, one should remember that the Gallic Chronicle of 452 notes that Germanus had become renowned for his miraculous powers prior to his passing. Admittedly, this is a subjective statement by the

chronicler, but this high praise seems more evident when one considers the chronicler's views on the religious doctrines promoted by Pelagius and Augustine.

Here is an entry that appears between 397 and 405 in the Gallic Chronicle of 452<sup>106</sup>:

“The insane Pelagius tried to soil the churches with his purulent doctrine.”

Next is an entry that appears between 416 and 420<sup>107</sup>:

“The heresy of the *praedestinati*, said to have started with Augustine, began to spread in this period.”

By not siding with either of the doctrines, the chronicler appears to provide a positive and independent view of Germanus. Therefore, in summary, we have Bishop Germanus dedicating his monastery to the martyred twin physicians, a contemporary of Germanus telling how the bishop is famous for his miracles, and Constantius noting a handful of physical ailments that the bishop cures. These details lead this author to speculate that Bishop Germanus had some skills of a physician.

Continuing on, loosely dated to the reign of Emperors Honorius and Theodosius (408-423), there was a person called Aurelius Januarius.<sup>108</sup> It has been suggested by J. R. Martindale that this man may have been the governor of Numidia. Instead of being the governor as speculated, perhaps Aurelius Januarius is the head of the governor's staff like the man of high character who Constantius mentions. With access to a ship, he could sail north from Numidia to reach the Rhone. Taking that to the Saone would carry Januarius to places frequented by Germanus.

Following through with this conjecture, it needs to be explained why Aurelius Januarius would come to see the bishop in the first place. Maybe, Germanus and Auerlius Januarius had previously met in the Gallic lecture-rooms or in Rome while studying law. At that time, Germanus gave him an open-door invitation if Aurelius Januarius was ever in the area of

Auxerre. Whatever the case, the Januarius mentioned by Constantius and Aurelius Januarius would have been contemporaries and each of them would have held high provincial positions. In 413, Aurelius Januarius would have had good reason to flee Numidia, if he had any ties to Heraclianus, the count of Africa. Emperor Honorius executes Count Heraclianus for treason that year. Olympiodorus of Thebes notes that upon confiscating the count's wealth, much less gold was seized than had been expected.<sup>109</sup> Maybe, this anticipated wealth resided with Aurelius Januarius. Being of high character, he retained the imperial wealth, knowing it was earmarked for building repairs. Fearing for his life, though, he temporarily flees Africa and goes somewhere no one expects. Though highly unlikely, this scenario is still a possibility.

Next for further consideration are the sections dealing with the first British mission. Luckily, it is recorded by the nearly impeccable source, Prosper of Aquitaine. As such, it is a cornerstone of any British timeline for the fifth century. Constantius of Lyon elaborates on the mission. Bede copies *Vita Germani* for the English.<sup>110</sup> Nennius establishes Bishop Germanus's connection to the infamous Vortigern<sup>111</sup> while Geoffrey of Monmouth, if even possible, clarifies the year by mentioning only Lupus.

Here is what Geoffrey tells of Bishop Germanus<sup>112</sup>:

By this action (Vortigern marries Renwein and gives Hengist Kent.) he immediately incurred the enmity of his leaders and, indeed, of his own sons – for he was already the father of three boys, whose names were Vortimer, Katigern and Paschent.

It was at this time that St. Germanus, the Bishop of Auxerre, came, and Lupus, Bishop of Troyes, with him, to preach the word of God to the Britons: for their Christian faith had been corrupted not only by the pagans but also by the Pelagian heresy, the poison of which had infected them for many a long day. However, the religion of the true faith was restored to them by the preaching of these saintly men. This they made clear almost daily by frequent miracles, for

through their agency God performed many wonders, which Gildas has described with great literary skill in his treatise.

After the fourth victory against the Saxons by Vortimer, the following appears<sup>113</sup>:

As soon as he had won this victory, Vortimer started to hand back to the inhabitants of Britain the possessions which had been removed from them. He treated them with affection and honour, and, at the request of St. Germanus, restored their churches.

There is no further mentioning of Bishop Germanus by Geoffrey of Monmouth. Though possibly insignificant, this author finds his terse handling of Bishop Germanus noteworthy. Geoffrey thins out Nennius's version, and then gives Gildas as his source, whom did not know of, or refused to mention Bishop Germanus for whatever reason. With this being said, three hundred years after Germanus's first known trip to Britain, Constantius's version is written down as British history by the English. The essence of it, as a historical account, remains unquestioned for, at least, another four hundred years on the island.

Easily, §66 of Nennius<sup>114</sup> and the battles of Vortimer could be incorporated into this present chronology for *Vita Germani*. The 'Alleluia Victory' could be seen as Vortimer's first victory, the one on the river Darent/Derwent in Kent. The enemy identified as Octa, Ebissa, and the Picts that they recruited while stationed near the Wall.<sup>115</sup> Much more could be speculated about the first trip, but the main point has been shown. Constantius's account of Bishop Germanus with Bishop Lupus in Britain forms the bridge between history and legend. And, as such, this recalibration of *Vita Germani* being presented in this paper may help untangle other facts from fiction.

And though it is understandable that some readers may cringe or even stop reading once Geoffrey of Monmouth has been referred to as a source, the intent is to present other possible points of connection between history and legend. The existence of Bishop Germanus in the

controversial work shows that it contains some truth. How much beyond that is highly debatable and will be left for another time.

The next item warranting further discussion occurs in chapter 23. Here, Constantius mentions the bishop's arrival in Lyon. Most commentators view Constantius as a resident of Lyon. This author is no different on that point. Still, E. A. Thompson brings up several issues that should be addressed. Thompson declares, "Constantius reports practically nothing about the visit to Lyon." Several lines later, Thompson adds that "(Constantius) does not refer to the local bishop or tell us what *he* thought of the distinguished visitor," then states. "Not a single person is named in this flat, meagre account. It is hard to see why the chapter relating to Lyon of all places, the writer's native city (according to the common view), should be so thin and empty compared with the chapters on either side of it which take the saint to Alise and Arles. There is a problem here which is not easy to resolve."<sup>116</sup>

Though impossible to prove, this author feels that Constantius's silence here is an example of his own humility. Based on what Constantius states in §23, it seems quite apparent that he refrains from telling more. The narration states that all—"regardless of age and sex" — sought him out.<sup>117</sup> That being said, Constantius and Patiens, the future bishop of Lyon, would have been among these people. Though no more than ten, Sidonius might even remember when the bishop came to town. Hoare speculates that Constantius would have been about twenty at the time of the bishop's visit. Constantius would have had personal memories of Germanus's stop. Easily, Constantius could have told about this, but he does not. This marks a high-level of restraint on his part. Though less personable, this omission gives the *vita* a more impartial feel. Another reason for the lack of commentary is that a reading audience of Lyon would have already known the tales from where they reside. Or, alternatively, Constantius sought to avoid

the hassle of picking who to put in and who to leave out of his narration. By naming no one, he does not offend anyone.

Next, let us move on to consider the second trip to Britain. Based on the general chronology provided so far, this would have occurred between 435 and 442. This is established by the bishop's two meetings, the first with Auxiliaris and the second with King Goar. Some suggest that the trip with Bishop Severus did not occur. This speculation seems flawed for various reasons. Silence or the specific wording of Prosper should not be used to prove that the second trip did not occur. This should be apparent from his lack of details regarding Stilicho and his silence on the Bacaudae. As E. A. Thompson points out when referring to the name Elafius, "...there is no reason whatever for thinking that this is Constantius's own invention."<sup>118</sup> And though, the details of the second trip are truly scarce, they need to be considered further.

Nicholas J. Higdam puts forth a reason for mentioning the second trip which has strong appeal. Higdam suggests that by "including the second visit, Constantius was able to reposition Germanus as the central figure in these 'British' episodes, simply because it was Germanus alone who had made both visits."<sup>119</sup> This seems logical if Constantius assumes that his audience shares Sidonius's opinion of the two bishops. Sidonius writes a letter of apology to Prosper, the new bishop of Orleans. Previously, he had promised to write a narration on the Life of St. Annianus (St. Aignan) centralizing on the siege of Orleans, but he quickly realizes the amount of work involved, and no longer cares to complete it. His letter to Bishop Prosper opens with: "You wished me to celebrate the glory of the holy Annianus, the greatest and most perfect of prelates, equal to Lupus (of Troyes), and no unworthy rival of Germanus (of Auxerre)..."<sup>120</sup> Though it is his standard hyperbole, Sidonius's opener still presents the bishops as equals. As such, with Constantius's "pre-eminent gift of eloquence ... in the discussion of public affairs",<sup>121</sup> he subtly

states Germanus's precedence over Lupus, a man still active during the writing of *Vita Germani*, and a man who could still feel slighted. The latter point is evident from another apology letter by Sidonius, that one directly addressed to Bishop Lupus.<sup>122</sup>

In regards to the locations that Bishop Germanus visits while in Britain, the shrine in Verulamium seems to be the only site identified, but even this is uncertain. That being said, the argument put forth by Thompson identifying London as the focal point of the first trip seems credible. He bases this on London's large population, its proximity to the shrine, and the ease that the heresy could have spread due to its numerous roads and being a port to the Continent.<sup>123</sup> Such a location would fit with the battles of Vortimer, also.

E. A. Thompson states that the second trip ended up at the same location.<sup>124</sup> This author does not adhere to that assumption. Beginning with our sources, we have the Gallic Chronicle stating that the British provinces fell under the authority of the Saxons before the middle of the fifth century. What does that truly mean? At that time, it would have meant something different for a Briton living on the west side of the island than one on the eastside. The level of authority that the Saxons could exact on Britain would be effected by different factors. The proximity to the Continent would be one of them. Naturally, those living in the west would be, somewhat, insulated from attacks by the Saxons and other mainland Germans. For the east, as each day goes by, though, the people of influence would increasingly be German. The Gallic entry marks the tipping point of Saxon authority. Germanus may have reported this or others traveling with him did, though *Vita Germani* gives no impression of this. It still leads to the likelihood that the Christians calling upon Germanus and the Gallic Church came from the west side of the island.

Building on this general thought that the second trip ended up in the west, let us draw in Elafius, the only living Briton named by Constantius. In his discussion on the subject, Andrew

Breeze provides three variations of this man's name (Elafus, Elaphus, Elafius).<sup>125</sup> Breeze rejects the last one due to the first two appearing in the best texts of *Vita Germani*. Contrary to Leslie Alcock's assumption that the name is Celtic, Breeze suggests that it is Greek, deriving from the word "elaphos" for deer.<sup>126</sup> He ends his brief discussion by saying that "Elaphus is far more likely to have been an official in the Roman tradition than any 'local Celtic king'."<sup>127</sup>

The people on or near the Bristol Channel kept in contact with long distance traders well into the sixth century. Mediterranean dishware and amphoras litter numerous sites on both sides of the channel. By land, about a hundred and fifty miles lay between Dinas Powys and Cadbury. The distance is much shorter by water. These two sites, sitting on opposite sides of the channel, have yielded large quantities of high-quality, imported pottery.<sup>128</sup> In route by Roman roads from Dinas Powys to Cadbury, one would travel north to Gloucester, east to Cirencester, then south through Bath. All five of these sites exhibit late 5<sup>th</sup>-century activity.<sup>129</sup> This **n**-shaped cluster of sites on the channel seems like the logical area for a leading man of a province to reside.

With a basic region, time, and name of a British leader, one would think someone would fit the profile. Unfortunately, there is no decisive choice only further speculation. Still, it seems prudent to make a passing reference to a man mentioned by Geoffrey of Monmouth. One of the reasons for drawing attention to this Briton is the similarity between his name (Eldadus) and the man mentioned by Constantius (Elafius). This author suggests that they may be the same person with the different spellings resulting from some sort of copying error. Geoffrey of Monmouth tells of Eldadus, bishop of Gloucester, but gives no indication that he interacted with Germanus. Still, the bishops would have been contemporaries if the former even existed.<sup>130</sup> As such, based on the growing authority of the Saxons and the high amount of rich imports to the Bristol Channel, this author speculates that the man-in-question lived in the western province of

Britannia Prima, with a possibility of residing in Gloucester if the name Eldadus evolved from Elafius.

Next, let us shift our attention to the meeting between Bishop Germanus and King Goar. This might not have been their first encounter. When still a *dux*, Germanus could have interacted with Goar at some level. This is based on Goar's involvement with imperial affairs in the first decade of the fifth century. Though the Alan king elevates Jovinus at Moguntiacum in Upper Germany, Goar could have been besieged with the usurper at Valentia/Valence in 413.<sup>131</sup> This same area could have been covered while serving Emperor Honorius. Both Germanus and Goar would have been operating in overlapping regions of Gaul for nearly five years. Though it appears that Germanus would have been conscripted around the time of Jovinus's elevation, maybe the shift of power among the Gallic officials was, more or less, bloodless. If Germanus and Goar had dealt with each other amicably in the past, then this might help explain how a Christian bishop is able to secure a truce with a pagan king with little effort thirty years later.

Though not directly related to Tibatto or the Pelagian heresy, the next bit is being offered as contemporary examples of the imperial legal system. The condensed details appear in **APPENDIX A** under the years 443, 445, and 448. For the first year, Prosper states the following about the Manichees apprehended in Rome: "...the confessions of those arrested in Rome might reveal the identity of their teachers, bishops or priests, and the provinces or cities in which they lived. Many bishops in the east imitated the energy of the apostolic governor."<sup>132</sup> Imperial order ripples out from Rome at this point. A couple years later in 445, Hydatius states in his chronicle that "...certain Manichees who had been in hiding for some years were uncovered due to episcopal reports sent to Antoninus, bishop of Emerita, by Bishops Hydatius and Thoribius, who had previously interrogated them..."<sup>133</sup> And finally, a few years later, Roman law returns to the

fringe of the empire in 448 when the Gallic Chronicle of 452 states: “Eudoxius, a physician by profession and of perverse, if well-developed, talents, fled to the Huns when implicated in the *Bacaudae* that took place at that time.”<sup>134</sup>

If the ecclesiastical and civil justices function in similar fashion, then one can see why the Romans would not execute Tibatto immediately when they captured him in 437. They would have sought to interrogate Tibatto. The information he could confess would have been invaluable in quieting the uprising. It could have led to the implications of men like Eudoxius. In turn, though, this would allow Tibatto the chance to escape and stir up trouble a few years later.

The next point of discussion is highly speculative. As previously mentioned, Professor Wood has suggested that the curing of the 10-year-old girl in §15 is actually a time reference to how long the British had strayed from the orthodoxy. In conjunction with this thought, maybe Constantius provides a second time marker in §29 when Bishop Germanus cures a 20-year-old girl so she can speak, once more. If this was the case, then the year would be 439. A coincidence or not, that year’s entry by Prosper of Aquitaine is the last time he mentions the Pelagian heresy. This author finds the wording of this entry peculiar and shall provide it in its entirety as it pertains to the heresy.

Prosper of Aquitaine states<sup>135</sup>:

“At this time, Julian of Eclanum, a most boastful defender of the Pelagian error was aroused by an immoderate longing for a formerly lost bishopric. By the varied art of deceiving, and exhibiting the pretence of having amended his ways, he endeavored to insinuate himself into the communion of the church. But Pope Sixtus, with the urging of Leo the deacon, opposed these tricks and allowed no approach to lie open to these pestilential efforts, and he caused all Catholics to rejoice in throwing back the deceitful beast, as if the apostolic sword then for the first time beheaded the most proud heresy.”

This entry says a lot, but specifies very little. Still, it seems apparent that Julian returns to Italy. And by a deceitful manner, he tries to rejoin the church, but his subterfuge is discovered and he is denied. Though attributed to Leo the deacon, this author wonders if Bishop Germanus uncovered this attempt initially when he stopped in Milan. By that time, Germanus might have been one of the few people still alive that could positively identify Julian. The two men would have been close in age. Following such a conjecture naturally, Julian of Eclanum would have been the one who shouts at Bishop Germanus, “Be content that your prayers have defeated both us and the ocean.”<sup>136</sup> It is in §13, on the way to battle the Pelagian heresy in Britain that Bishop Germanus defeats the ocean storm with prayers.<sup>137</sup> If this is the case and the twenty year old girl is another time reference, it would influence how §40 is dated, also. It would shift the meeting between Germanus and Goar from 442 to 439. The author finds the details surrounding the 442 date more convincing, though.

Moving to the last point of discussion, it is time to address the title of patrician given to Sigisult by Constantius. In his work dealing with the subject matter, Professor Wood states:

“Strictly speaking, Constantius’s description of Sigisult as a *patricius* ought to date the death of Germanus to the period after 440, although it is possible that Constantius was mistaken about the precise chronology of Sigisult’s career.”<sup>138</sup>

T. D. Barnes establishes several points about the title of patrician and its usage. Barnes shows in various chronicles that the title is given to men who are not technically patricians. More importantly, he establishes that others besides Aëtius are properly addressed as a patrician while Aëtius holds the title, also.<sup>139</sup> Furthermore, based on two separate laws, Barnes suggests that Sigisult would have become a patrician after June 24, 440, but before March 13, 443.<sup>140</sup> As a final note from his work, Barnes states the following<sup>141</sup>:

“Moreover, a subtle and interesting change can be observed in the way in which Valentinian addresses Aëtius. When he was the only *patricius*, he was merely *patricius noster*. But when other *patricii* existed, he became *magnificus vir parens patriciusque noster* (Nov. Val. 36, of 29 June 452).”

If Valentinian III uses ‘the Magnificent’ to signify that Aëtius is the high-ranking patrician, Constantius might have followed his lead. Though he does not suggest this, Thompson does state, “In fact, Constantius is meticulous and precise, by the standards of writers of his time, in recording not only names but also official titles of persons on the Continent.”<sup>142</sup> The use of this title for Aëtius in this way would double the likelihood that Constantius thought Sigisult was a patrician, also. This makes a scribal error in regards to the title more unlikely.

Working with this assumption on the skills of Constantius, an objection may be placed against Bishop Germanus dying in 437. In that year, both Aëtius and Sigisult are consuls, but Constantius addresses neither of them as such. That type of omission seems doubtful if Constantius was truly strict in the recording of proper titles for various people.

What is most important here, though, is if Constantius calls Aëtius ‘the Magnificent’ to signify that he is the high-ranking patrician. If this is truly the case, then §28 does share three points of similarity with the Gallic Chronicle of 452. Both establish trouble in Armorica, Aëtius draws the Alans into the land dispute, and Aëtius is identified as a patrician.

### **Summary**

By now, it should be clear that the episcopate of Bishop Germanus begins and ends in turbulent times. Sources show Germanus being conscripted after 409 and confronting King Goar in 442. For the years in between, Germanus cares for the sick and outcasts through enormous famines and long cold winters, crossing rivers and oceans to do so. And, as wars rage on, the bishop remains ever vigilant. He is a beacon, a guide for future bishops to follow.<sup>143</sup>

Though this is a general view of an extraordinary man, these events in his life have been synchronized with contemporary sources in an uncorrupted manner. Granted, this chronology does not address the nuisances of the text. This author feels that some of Constantius's word choices distort how the bishop's real life elapsed. Constantius has written a sleek, flowing *vita*. His intent would have been to hold the reader's attention. Skewing the chronology would be an unintended consequence. Regarding this matter, Constantius states, "May my readers not scrutinize my words too closely..."<sup>144</sup> As such, some wiggle room should be allotted. This seems apparent since Constantius names neither the predecessor nor successor of Germanus. The text does not imply that Germanus became bishop immediately after the death of Amatoris. Instead, the rebelling people conscript him.

This author realizes that such an interpretation would nullify Wood's dating maxim put forth at the beginning of this paper. Still, this would not change the underlining facts found in the contemporary sources and how they match up with *Vita Germani*. There would still be the first overthrow of Gallic officials (409), and the regime change when Jovinus comes to power (412), pestilences and famine (413), the visit to Britain (429), the miracles of Germanus (433), the meeting of Auxiliaris (435/439), the rebellion and capture of Tibatto (435/437), and the final suppression of Armorica (442). In this context, Germanus would have passed away later that year. This seems to be the logical conclusion to draw from the noted events when compared to contemporary sources. A more inclusive chronology appears under **APPENDIX B** to facilitate the reviewing of the various dated events and speculations mentioned in this paper.

Unfortunately, we may never know certain details of Germanus's life, or Constantius's for that matter. Hopefully, though, what has been presented here will inspire and assist in future commentaries on these captivating individuals.

## APPENDIX A

### Events involving Gaul, Aëtius, and/or Civil Disorder

#### **427 AD**

JoA – Battles against the Visigoths and Franks.  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – Frees Arles from the Goths.  
HYD – N/A

#### **428 AD**

JoA – Battles against the Visigoths and Franks.  
PoA – Battles the Franks only.  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – N/A

#### **429 AD**

JoA – Supplants Felix.  
PoA – Felix is patrician. Aëtius is master of the soldiers. Germanus goes to Britain.  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – N/A

#### **430 AD**

JoA – Murders Felix.  
PoA – Same as JoA.  
GC452 – Tries to destroy the Juthungi.  
HYD – Defeats Anaolsus and his Goths near Arles. Battles the Nori. Same as JoA and GC452.

#### **431 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – Subdues the Nori. Hydatius leads an embassy to Aëtius in Gaul.

#### **432 AD**

JoA – Boniface defeats Aëtius, but dies. Aëtius flees then regains power.  
PoA – Consul. Same as JoA.  
GC452 – Same as PoA, notes only Boniface's victory and death. A great many suffer from the severe cold.  
HYD – After the Franks's defeat, Hydatius returns with Count Censorius, a Roman envoy to the Sueves.

#### **433 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – Aëtius flees then regains power. Romans ask Goths for help. Bishop Germanus becomes famous.  
HYD – N/A

#### **434 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – Receives favor.  
HYD – N/A

#### **435 AD**

JoA – Defeats the Burgundians and kills their king, Guntiarus/Gundichar.  
PoA – Same as JoA.  
GC452 – Tibatto leads rebellion in Farther Gaul. The start of the Bacaudic revolt.  
HYD – N/A

## APPENDIX A

### Events involving Gaul, Aëtius, and/or Civil Disorder – cont.

#### **436 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – NSM – Troubles with the Goths. Litorius lifts the Gothic siege on Narbonne.  
GC452 – In a memorable war, Aëtius destroys the Burgundians and their king.  
HYD – Goths lay siege to Narbonne. Aëtius defeats the Burgundians.

#### **437 AD**

JoA – Fights the Goths to a standstill.  
PoA – Consul. NSM – War is waged against the Goths.  
GC452 – Tibatto is captured. Other leaders put in bonds or killed. The Bacaudae quiets down.  
HYD – Slaughters 20,000 Burgundians. Narbonne is freed from siege.

#### **438 AD**

JoA – Represses the Armoric rebels.  
PoA – NSM – Measures against the Goth in Gaul go well.  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – Slaughters 8,000 Goths.

#### **439 AD**

JoA – Represses the Armoric rebels.  
PoA – Litorius attacks the Goths, gets captured then executed. Romans make peace with the Goths.  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – Same as PoA.

#### **440 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – Leo the deacon mitigates the issues between Aëtius and Albinus in Gaul.  
GC452 – Aëtius pacifies Gaul and returns to Italy. Sambida and his Alans settle on the lands near Valence.  
HYD – N/A

#### **441 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – The Saxon subjugate the British provinces.  
HYD – In Spain, Asturius—general of both services—slaughters the Bacaudae of Tarraconensis.

#### **442 AD**

JoA – Represses the Armoric rebels.  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – The Alans take control of Farther Gaul with the consent of Aëtius the patrician.  
HYD – N/A

#### **443 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A ~Pope Leo arrests and interrogates the Manichees for other city & provincial supporters.~  
GC452 – NSM – The Burgundians and the locals divide up the lands in and around Sapaudia.  
HYD – In Spain, Merobaudes slaughters the Bacaudae of Aracelli.

## APPENDIX A

### Events involving Gaul, Aëtius, and/or Civil Disorder – cont.

#### **444 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – N/A

#### **445 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – N/A ~Bishop Hydatius interrogates and reports the Manichees in Asturica.~

#### **446 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – Consul.  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – N/A

#### **447 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – N/A

#### **448 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – Implicated in the Bacaudae, Eudoxius the physician flees to the Huns.  
HYD – N/A

#### **449 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – Basilius gathers together the Bacaudae and kill federates in the church of Tyrasso.

#### **450 AD**

JoA – N/A  
PoA – N/A  
GC452 – N/A  
HYD – N/A

#### **451 AD**

JoA – Defeats Attila in his final great battle in the West.  
PoA – Same as JoA.  
GC452 – Same as JoA but NSM  
HYD – Same as JoA.

## **APPENDIX B**

### The Contemporary View of *Vita Germani*

- 409— The people of Constantine III overthrow the Gallic officials of Honorius.
- 410— Four men claim to be the Emperor of the West. The Goths sack Rome.
- 411— The Romans execute Constantine the usurper. Loyalists of Honorius gain offices.
- 412— The elevation of Jovinus and the conscription of Germanus occurs.
- 413 — Januarius misplaces his gold. Famine consumes Gaul. The people of Auxerre fall ill.
- 429 — On April 7, Germanus & Vortimer beat the Saxons & Picts(Alleluia Victory/R. Derwent).
- 432 — Gaul suffers from a severe winter.
- 433 — Bishop Germanus becomes famous.
- 435 — Tibatto and others revolt.
- 436 — Count Litorius crushes the forces of the Bacaudic revolt.
- 437 — Tibatto & some leaders are captured while others are killed. The revolt quiets down.
- After his capture in 437 but before 442 — Tibatto escapes from Roman custody.
- 438 — Aëtius campaigns in Armorica.
- 439 — Aëtius campaigns in Armorica.
- 440 — A restless peace hangs over Armorica.
- After June 24, 440 but before July 442 — Sigisuult becomes a patrician.
- 441 — Bishop Germanus meets up with Elafius in Britain. Trouble rises up in Armorica.
- Spring of 442 — An Armoric deputation requests Germanus to negotiate a peace with Goar.
- 442 — Bishop Germanus secures a temporary truce with King Goar.
- 442 — On April 17/June 19, Bishop Germanus arrives in Milan.
- 442 — Tibatto incites another revolt in Armorica.
- 442 — On July 31, Bishop Germanus dies in Ravenna.

1. The Life of St. Germanus, Bishop of Auxerre. Constantius of Lyons. The Western Fathers. Edited and translated by F. R. Hoare. (New York, NY: Harper Torchbooks, 1954), pp. 283-320. All quotations for *Vita Germani* shall be taken from this source. Future citations from this source shall appear as followed: (VG§ #. page #) For example, the entire first chapter of *Vita Germani* would be cited as VG§1. pp. 286-287 while the beginning of the first chapter would be cited as VG§1. p. 286. It should be noted that Hoare sees the episcopate running from 418 to 448. Following Wilhelm Levison, Hoare views the completion of *Vita Germani* occurring around 480.
2. Wood, Ian. ‘The end of Roman Britain: Continental evidence and parallels’, *Gildas: New Approaches*, edited by Michael Lapidge and David N. Dumville (Suffolk UK: The Boydell Press, 1984) pp. 14-15
3. *Ibid.* p. 15. Wood argues for the use of *Vita Seueri* due to it stating that the funeral procession of Bishop Germanus passes through Vienne during the pontificate of Pascentius. Pascentius’s successor, Cladius, attended the Council of Orange on 11/8/441.
4. Mathisen, R. W. ‘The last year of saint Germanus of Auxerre’, *Analecta Bollandiana* 99 (1981) p. 158. Mathisen argues for a later date for the passing of the bishop, due to his alleged involvement in the Chelidonium affair. As Ian Wood states on the same page of the previous citation, the papal literature makes no reference to Bishop Germanus. Besides that, E.A. Thompson points out other issues in: Thompson, E. A. Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain. – Studies in Celtic History (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 57 note 13. He draws attention to the shift from plural to singular in *Vita S. Hilarii*. On p. 59 is where Thompson states there is no papal mentioning of Germanus.
5. VG§42. p. 318
6. Wood, Ian. ‘The end of Roman Britain: Continental evidence and parallels’, *Gildas: New Approaches*, edited by Michael Lapidge and David N. Dumville (Suffolk UK: The Boydell Press, 1984) p. 9
7. VG 2nd-dedication. p. 285; VG§23. p. 305; VG§46. p. 320
8. VG 1st-dedication. p. 284
9. VG 2nd-dedication. pp. 284-5
10. VG Preface. p. 286
11. VG§1. pp. 286-7
12. Thompson, E. A. Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain. – Studies in Celtic History (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 10
13. VG§2. pp. 287

14. Snyder, Christopher A. *An Age of Tyrants* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988) p. 22

15. Wood, Ian. 'The end of Roman Britain: Continental evidence and parallels', *Gildas: New Approaches*, edited by Michael Lapidge and David N. Dumville (Suffolk UK: The Boydell Press, 1984) p. 2

16. Brooks, Deanna. *Prosper's chronicle: A critical edition and translation of the edition of 445 pp. 70-1*. Department of Classics and Religious Studies – A thesis submitted to the Faculty of Graduate and Postdoctoral Studies in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the Master of Arts degree in Classical Studies. Downloaded on December 21, 2018. Brooks uses the spelling 'Ragadaisus' instead of 'Radagaisus', but provides no reason for doing so. Regarding the lack details about Stilicho, this omission is even more pronounced when it is realized that Prosper and the Gallic Chronicle record many of the same events for that period. Both make note of the panegyrist of Stilicho, Claudian. The former states that Claudian had become well known while the latter states that he is worthy of admiration.

17. *Gallic Chronicle of 452. From Roman to Merovingian Gaul*. Edited and translated by Alexander Callander Murray. (Petersborough, ON Canada: Broadview Press Ltd., 2000) pp. 79-80. Future citations from this source shall appear as followed: GC452 p. #. This current citation would appear as GC452 pp. 79-80 in a future notation.

18. Gordon, C. D. *The Age of Attila* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Paperback, 1966) p. 30. p. 25 from the same source tells how Stilicho had been appointed guardian of the emperors Arcadius and Honorius.

19. *Ibid.* p. 30

20. GC452 p. 80

21. Gordon, C. D. *The Age of Attila* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Paperback, 1966) p. 36. In *Flavius Merobaudes: a Translation and Historical Commentary*. Translated by F. M. Clover (Philadelphia, PA 1971) on p. 46, Clover is discussing the Bacaudic movement. His comments seem applicable to the usurpers in the first decade of the fifth century as well. He states: "They (the Bacaudic movement) did not necessarily want to dissociate themselves from the Roman pattern of living altogether, for this was the only way of life to which they were accustomed. Instead, they apparently desired to rectify the misgovernment of the Roman authorities by establishing a separate, quasi-independent society on the Roman model." With that being said, the usurpers would have governmental officials to replace those of the legitimate emperor.

22. *The Chronicle of Prosper Aquitaine. From Roman to Merovingian Gaul*. Edited and translated by Alexander Callander Murray. (Petersborough, ON Canada: Broadview Press Ltd., 2000) p. 64. Future citations from this source shall appear as followed: PoA p. #. This current citation would appear as PoA p. 64 in a future notation.

23. The Chronicle of Hydatius. From Roman to Merovingian Gaul. Edited and translated by Alexander Callander Murray. (Petersborough, ON Canada: Broadview Press Ltd., 2000) pp. 86-87. Future citations from this source shall appear as followed: HYD p. #. This current citation would appear as HYD pp. 86-87 in a future notation. The following appears in Gildas: The Ruin of Britain and Other Works. Edited and translated by Michael Winterbottom (West Sussex, UK: Phillimore & Co. Ltd., 2002), p. 23 in §19.3-4: “The pitiable citizens were torn apart by their foes like lambs by the butcher; their life became like that of beasts of the field. For they resorted to looting each other, there being only a tiny amount of food to give brief sustenance to the wretched people; and the disasters from aboard were increased by internal disorders, for as result of constant devastations of this kind the whole region came to lack the staff of any food, apart from such comfort as the art of the huntsman could procure them.” This graphic language seems to resemble the apocalyptic tone of Hydatius.

24. VG§6. p. 290

25. Friedlaender, Gary E. MD, Friedlaender, Linda K. BA, MS. ‘Saints Cosmas and Damian: Patron Saints of Medicine’ *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*. Published online 9 June 2016. On p. 1766, they are “referred to as anargyroi (Greek for “without silver” [1, 5])” for not accepting payment. Bishop Germanus fell extremely short on this virtue since he received 200 gold pieces from the men of Leporius to treat their master in VG§33. pp. 312-3. P. 1768 of ‘Saints Cosmas and Damian’ states that by “the orders of Diocletian, Cosmas and Damian were arrested for refusing to renounce their faith and then tortured by Lysias.”

26. VG§7. pp. 290-1; Thompson, E. A. Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain. – Studies in Celtic History (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 10, Thompson points out that Januarius would have been heading for Sens, the provincial capital of Lugdunensis Senonia, before breaking from his journey to visit Bishop Germanus. Generally speaking, this is a fair assumption, but Constantius does not specify which province Januarius originated from before visiting Bishop Germanus. This leaves open other possibilities. See the conjectures and ramifications discussion regarding Januarius.

27. VG§8. p. 292

28. GC452 p. 81

29. VG§9. p. 293

30. VG§10. pp. 294-5

31. VG§11. p. 295

32. VG§12. pp. 295-6; PoA p. 68. Though Prosper of Aquitaine dates the event, the details vary slightly between his and Constantius’s account. They differ on who gave the authority for the British mission. According to Prosper, Rome gave it while Constantius’s narrative states that the British people and the Gallic synod sanctioned it.

33. VG§13. pp. 296-7

34. VG§14. pp. 297-8

35. VG§15. pp. 298-9

36. VG§16. pp. 299-300

37. VG§17. pp. 300-1

38. VG§18. pp. 301-2

39. VG§19. p. 302

40. VG§20. pp. 302-3

41. VG§21. pp. 303-4

42. VG§22. p. 304

43. GC452 p. 83

44. GC452 p. 83

45. Thompson, E. A. *Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain.* – *Studies in Celtic History* (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 67

46. VG§23. p. 305. This author sees that Constantius chooses not to elaborate on the bishop's stop in Lyon, here, but it could be said that Constantius is holding back on telling more about his visit with Bishop Hilary. Still, this does not change the fact that the papal literature fails to mention the involvement of Germanus in the Chelidonium affair.

47. VG§24. pp. 305-6

48. VG§25. p. 306

49. VG§26. p. 307

50. VG§27. pp. 307-8

51. VG§28. p. 308

52. GC452 p. 84

53. Gordon, C. D. *The Age of Attila* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Paperback, 1966) pp. 49-50. Gordon tells of the possibility that there were two writers working under the name John of

Antioch, one from seventh century and the other from tenth. Gordon feels that the former was responsible for the fifth century entries.

54. *Ibid.* p. 193. Gordon thinks he utilized Zosimus, Socrates, Priscus and Candidus.

55. Gregory of Tours – *The History of the Franks*. Translated by Lewis Thorpe. (London UK: Penguin Books Ltd., 1974) p. 123

56. Gordon, C. D. *The Age of Attila* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Paperback, 1966) p. 39. In fragment 17 from Olympiodorus of Thebes, the year(s) for the reign of Jovinus seems to begin in 411 while it is said to run from 412 to 413 on p. 59 of the same source in fragment 18. HYD p. 87 supports 412 to 413, but PoA p. 65 states that Jovinus rises and falls in 413.

57. *Ibid.* pp. 47-50

58. PoA pp. 67-73

59. GC452 pp. 82-85

60. HYD pp. 89-92

61. VG§29. p. 309

62. VG§30. p. 310

63. VG§31. pp. 310-1. It should be noted that Ralph Mathisen offers some interesting comments regarding this section in his article: ‘The Last Year’ pp. 153-4. He use it to help establish his dating of the bishop’s death to 446. Ultimately, it fails to support a later date of death in the opinion of this author.

64. VG§32. p. 311. In Mathisen’s work ‘The Last Year’ p. 156 note 22, he states that this episode should not be dated to the feast of the city’s saints on June 19. Instead, it should be dated to “the celebration of the *natalis omnium martyrum*, which occurred on the Friday after Easter.” In 442, Easter falls on April 12 according to Laughery, K. (Wed., 4/11/18). *The Date of Easter Sunday, A.D. 326 – 4099*. Ret. on 2/4/19 from <http://www.kevinlaughery.com/east4099.html> . As such, Germanus would have been in Milan on April 17.

65. VG§33. pp. 312-3

66. VG§34. p. 313

67. VG§35. pp. 313-4

68. VG§36. pp. 314-5

69. VG§37. p. 310

70. VG§38. pp. 315-6

71. PoA p. 67-68; There is a discrepancy between Prosper and the Gallic Chronicle on what year Sigisvult is sent to Africa. GC452 p. 82 – alleges Sigisvult goes to Africa in ~424.

72. Mathisen, R. W. ‘Sigisvult the Patrician, Maximinus the Arian, and political strategems in the Western Roman Empire c. 425-40’, *Early Medieval Europe* 8.2 (1999) pp. 178-9

73. PoA p. 69

74. Martindale, J. R. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire – Volume II A.D. 395-527* (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011) p. 1010. The last mentioning of Sigisvult which is securely dated occurs in a law by Valentinian III dated June 24, 440. It is entitled ‘On the Return of the Right to Bear Arms’. Mathisen provides details regarding this law in his article entitled: Sigisvult the Patrician, Maximinus the Arian, and political strategems in the Western Roman Empire c. 425-40’, *Early Medieval Europe* 8.2 (1999) p. 184. Possibly, by protecting Italy from the Vandals that year, the emperor made Sigisvult a patrician as a reward for his diligent efforts.

75. Barnes, T. D. ‘*Patricii* under Valentinian III’, *Phoenix* 29 (1975) 163

76. VG§39. pp. 316-7

77. GC452 p. 83

78. GC452 p. 83

79. VG§40. p. 317

80. Sidonius – *Poems Letters I-II*. Translated by W. B. Anderson (London UK: Harvard University Press, 1996) Vol. I, p. 141. Luckily “the conquest of the Aremoricans” described by Sidonius can be dated by using Prosper of Aquitaine to date Litorius riding south to battle the Goths laying siege to Narbonne. The 436 entry appears at PoA p. 69.

81. VG§41. pp. 317-8

82. VG§42. p. 318

83. VG§43. p. 318

84. VG§44. p. 319

85. VG§45. p. 319

86. VG§46. p. 319

87. VG§46. p. 320

88. Wood, Ian. ‘The end of Roman Britain: Continental evidence and parallels’, *Gildas: New Approaches*, edited by Michael Lapidge and David N. Dumville (Suffolk UK: The Boydell Press, 1984) p. 10

89. Thompson, E. A. Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain. – *Studies in Celtic History* (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 30

90. Sidonius – Poems Letters I-II. Translated by W. B. Anderson (London UK: Harvard University Press, 1996) pp. 491-3

91. Thompson, E. A. Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain. – *Studies in Celtic History* (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) pp. 86-7

92. PoA pp. 66; 68; 70; 72

93. The Letters of Sidonius – Volumes I & II. Translated by O. M. Dalton (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1915) Vol. II, p. 181

94. The Letters of Sidonius – Volumes I & II. Translated by O. M. Dalton (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1915) Vol. I, List of Correspondents, p. clxviii

95. Sidonius – Poems Letters I-II. Translated by W. B. Anderson (London UK: Harvard University Press, 1996) Vol. II, p. 509. Appearing in Letter 9 of Book 9 (p. 541 of current citation) Sidonius states that Bishop Faustus is married to the pagan spiritual bride, Philosophy. If this was not coming from a friend, the reference to a Christian bishop would be seen as slander. Clearly, Sidonius uses it as a compliment. The description of Faustus’s bride shaving off all of her hair has an undefined significance as it pertains to the addressee since the legendary Lives of St. Germanus in Nennius p. 29 §39 and p. 33 §48 has Faustus identifying his grandfather as his father in front Germanus and a British council by saying to Vortigern, “You are my father. Crop my head, and the hair of my head.” Though there may be no connection between the two, the parallelism between the hair-cutting rituals seems relevant to the discussion since each example involves Faustus and one of them directly pertaining to Bishop Germanus, as the legendary material states.

96. The Letters of Sidonius – Volumes I & II. Translated by O. M. Dalton (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1915) Vol. I, p. 54

97. Sidonius – Poems Letters I-II. Translated by W. B. Anderson (London UK: Harvard University Press, 1996) Vol. II, p. 513-5

98. Sidonius – Poems Letters I-II. Translated by W. B. Anderson (London UK: Harvard University Press, 1996) Vol. I, p. 467

99. HYD pp. 86-87

100. VG§2. p. 287; VG§7. pp. 290-1; VG§8. p. 292

101. PoA p. 66

102. PoA p. 64-65 states that Constantine III arrives in Gaul in 407 then is defeated and captured in 411. As previously noted, PoA p. 65 tells that Jovinus rises and falls in 413 while HYD p. 87 states Jovinus rises in 412 and falls in 413. The fragments of Olympiodorus vary between 411 and 412 for his ascension while 413 marks the year Jovinus was deposed.

103. Wood, Ian. ‘The end of Roman Britain: Continental evidence and parallels’, *Gildas: New Approaches*, edited by Michael Lapidge and David N. Dumville (Suffolk UK: The Boydell Press, 1984) pp. 10-1

104. Thompson, E. A. Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain. – *Studies in Celtic History* (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 87

105. Friedlaender, Gary E. MD, Friedlaender, Linda K. BA, MS. ‘Saints Cosmas and Damian: Patron Saints of Medicine’ *Clinical Orthopaedics and Related Research*. Published online 9 June 2016. p. 1766 lists the various miracle healings attributed to the twin physicians. On pp. 1766-77 of the same source, the cancerous leg of Justinian the deacon is discussed. At VG§27. p. 307, Germanus heals the British boy’s leg. The closest parallelism in healing miracles between Germanus and the twins might be the legs of the British boy and the deacon. At VG§45. p. 319, the badly paralyzed lady is healed by lying near the corpse of Germanus.

106. GC452 p. 79

107. GC452 p. 81

108. Martindale, J. R. *The Prosopography of the Later Roman Empire – Volume II* <sup>A.D.</sup> 395-527 (Cambridge, UK: Cambridge University Press, 2011) p. 585

109. Gordon, C. D. *The Age of Attila* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Paperback, 1966) p. 38 O.fr. 23

110. Bede, *The Ecclesiastical History of the English People – The Greater Chronicle – Bede’s Letter to Egbert*. Translated by Judith McClure and Roger Collins. (Oxford, UK: Oxford University Press, 1994) pp. 29-36

111. Nennius. *British History and the Welsh Annals*. Edited and translated by John Morris (London, UK: Phillimore & Co. Ltd., 1980) pp. 26-34 Future citations from this source shall appear as followed: Nennius p. #. This current citation would appear as Nennius pp. 26-34 in a future notation.

112. Geoffrey of Monmouth. *History of the Kings of Britain*. Translated by Lewis Thorpe. (Middlesex, UK: Penguin Books Ltd., 2002) p. 160. Future citations from this source shall

appear as followed: GoM p. #. This current citation would appear as GoM p. 160 in a future notation.

113. GoM p. 162

114. Nennius p. 39; Though the validity of §66 is questioned, neither its usage of consular dating (Stilicho as co-consul to Aurelianus in 400; Theodosius II to Valentinian III in 425; Felix to Taurus in 428), or any of the details it provides (the reign of Vortigern, the arrival of the English in Britain, the battle of Wallop) contradict or conflict with this paper. Based on the internal chronology of §66, the battle of Wallop would have occurred in 436, the same year that Litorius crushed the Bacaudic revolt. Any connection between the two would be highly speculative, of course.

115. VG§18. p. 301; Nennius, p. 31; GoM p. 162

116. Thompson, E. A. *Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain*. – *Studies in Celtic History* (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 79. The three quotations appear on the same page.

117. VG§23. p. 301

118. Thompson, E. A. *Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain*. – *Studies in Celtic History* (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 4

119. Higham, Nicholas J. ‘Constantius, St. Germanus and fifth-century Britain’ *Early Medieval Europe* 22 (2014) p. 133

120. *The Letters of Sidonius – Volumes I & II*. Translated by O. M. Dalton (Oxford, UK: Clarendon Press, 1915) Vol. II, p. 172

121. *Ibid.* Vol. II, p. 211

122. *Ibid.* Vol. II, pp. 195-9. Dalton dates this letter of apology to 477/478 based on the wording of p. 197 about ‘ten whole lustres’. Review p. 251 for Dalton’s complete explanation. This author finds the reason for Sidonius sending the letter interesting since it is in reference to Bishop Lupus receiving an unnamed book.

123. Thompson, E. A. *Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain*. – *Studies in Celtic History* (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 53

124. *Ibid.* p. 47

125. Breeze, Andrew. ‘Elaphus the Briton, St. Germanus, and Bede’ *Journal of Theological Studies*, Vol. 53, (2002) p. 556

126. *Ibid.* p. 556

127. *Ibid.* p. 557

128. Snyder, Christopher A. *An Age of Tyrants* (University Park, PA: The Pennsylvania State University Press, 1988) p. 191

129. *Ibid.* p. 155 for Gloucester; p. 154 for Cirencester; p. 150-1 for Bath

130. GoM p. 193; On p. 242 of Tatlock, John S. P. *The Legendary History of Britain. Geoffrey of Monmouth's Historia Regum Britanniae and Its Early Vernacular Versions* (New York, NY: Gordian Press, 1974), Tatlock states, "This vivid person is probably Geoffrey's creation; and it is needless to seek remoter precedents for this name than that in Nennius (§49), Eldat (Eldad)." This name reference by Tatlock does not fit the floruit of Bishop Germanus, though. There are several generations between Eldat and Vortigern the Thin. Still, Tatlock brings up other issues that need to be addressed like Eldadus being called the Bishop of Gloucester "eleven centuries before there was any." If he was truly a bishop, he should have been the bishop of Cirencester since it was the capital of the province. There is a high level of speculation with this proposed name association. This author sees the copier working with physically damaged source material, possibly water-stained pages where running ink morphs into Eldadus from Elafius.

131. Gordon, C. D. *The Age of Attila* (Ann Arbor, MI: Ann Arbor Paperback, 1966) p. 39

132. PoA p. 72

133. HYD p. 90

134. GC452 p. 84. For the most part, a loose interpretation is taken when reviewing the sources. This time, though, a narrower take might be more accurate. Eudoxius is identified as a physician not a soldier which gives the impression that he would not have been on the frontline of a battle except possibly as a field surgeon. As such, the word choice of being implicated implies that he was charged after a lengthy criminal investigation. So, "the Bacaudae that took place at that time", as mentioned in the entry, refers to the one quietened in 437 and extensively snuffed out in 442, not a separate open revolt in 448 which seems to be traditionally assumed.

135. PoA pp. 70-1

136. VG§32. p. 311

137. VG§13. p. 297

138. Wood, Ian. 'The end of Roman Britain: Continental evidence and parallels', *Gildas: New Approaches*, edited by Michael Lapidge and David N. Dumville (Suffolk UK: The Boydell Press, 1984) p. 16

139. Barnes, T. D. 'Patricii under Valentinian III', *Phoenix* 29 (1975) pp. 156-8

140. *Ibid.* pp. 158-9. Barnes explains how a law of precedence dated March 13, 443 implies that Sigisult became a patrician sometime after June 24, 440, but before the issuing of the 443 law. Barnes notes others coming to the same conclusion. Even though this has the potential of establishing Sigisult as a patrician by 442, Barnes views the episcopate of Germanus ending in 448.

141. *Ibid.* p. 166

142. Thompson, E. A. Saint Germanus of Auxerre and the end of Roman Britain. – Studies in Celtic History (Worcester UK: Billings & Sons Limited, reprint. 1988) p. 11.

143. Wood, Ian. ‘The end of Roman Britain: Continental evidence and parallels’, *Gildas: New Approaches*, edited by Michael Lapidge and David N. Dumville (Suffolk UK: The Boydell Press, 1984) p. 9 Wood states that *Vita Germani* is “almost a handbook for bishops in the 470’s and 480’s.”

144. VG 2nd-dedication. pp. 285